



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/884,122

06/20/2001

David Zhuang

042390.P11278

3474

8791

7590

10/05/2006

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN  
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
SEVENTH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

AILES, BENJAMIN A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 10/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/884,122	Applicant(s) ZHUANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Benjamin A. Ailes	Art Unit 2142	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 4-9, 12-21, 24-32 and 39-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 4-9, 12-21, 24-32, 39-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 6 June 2006, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. New grounds of rejection are set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid. A Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) has approved of reopening prosecution by signing below:

2. Claims 4-9, 12-21, 24-32 and 39-44 remain pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 4-9, 12-21, 24-32 and 39-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacNaughton et al. (US 6,020,884), hereinafter referred to as MacNaughton, in view of Tyra et al. (US 6,442,565 B1), hereinafter referred to as Tyra.

6. Regarding claim 4, MacNaughton teaches in column 7, lines 8-13 a remote messaging facility client, comprising a session agent (community client) for managing a remote messaging session (a persistent connection between client and server) established between a web client (user) and an event producer (community server). MacNaughton does not explicitly recite the step of "maintaining a persistent listening connection that listens to an event subscribed by the web client with a remote messaging facility server". MacNaughton teaches wherein a web client (a user) can subscribe to receive notifications about content and also subscribe to receive data content at specified intervals (see MacNaughton, col. 7, ll. 61-67 and col. 8, ll. 8-10). However, in related art, Tyra teaches a method wherein a queue is monitored by "listeners" persistently and when certain events appear in the queue, actions in regards

Art Unit: 2142

to notifying subscribed users to the event are performed (see Tyra, col. 7, ll. 11-15 and ll. 20-25) which teaches on the limitation of "maintaining a persistent listening connection" by the listeners continuously monitoring and further "listens to an event subscribed by the web client with a remote messaging facility" is taught by MacNaughton wherein MacNaughton teaches a user being able to subscribe to a notification service at specified intervals, therefore content data is monitored. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to enable MacNaughton's invention to be able to persistently listen for events to happen instead of at only specified intervals as evidenced by Tyra, wherein Tyra teaches it is advantageous to have a data structure continuously monitored for certain events to occur. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Tyra with the the teachings of MacNaughton because Tyra teaches that it is advantageous to improve upon notification systems in regards to the changing of data within distributed systems (Tyra, column 1, ll. 52-54). MacNaughton further teaches "a messaging agent for communicating with the remote messaging facility server on behalf of the web client during the remote messaging session, sending a request from the web client to the remote messaging facility server and receiving a response from the remote messaging facility server" wherein the community client communicates with the community server (col. 7, 10-20). MacNaughton teaches a message parser for parsing a response received by the messaging agent from the remote messaging facility server (col. 7, lines 27-36); and an event manager for managing event subscription and dispatching of an event that is subscribed by the web

client, received as a response from the remote messaging facility server, and parsed by the message parser (col. 9, lines 28-51).

7. Regarding claim 5, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the system further comprising a remote messaging facility client application programming interface, through which the web client communicates with the remote messaging facility client to issue a request, to subscribe an event, and to receive a response from the remote messaging facility server from the event manager (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 28-51). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 4 applies equally as well to claim 5.

8. Regarding claim 6, MacNaughton teaches in column 7, III. 8-13 a remote messaging facility server, comprising a session manager (community client) for managing a remote messaging session (a persistent connection between client and server) established with a web client (user) via a remote messaging facility client. MacNaughton does not explicitly the step of "maintaining a persistent listening connection that listens to an event subscribed by the web client, said web client issuing requests and receiving responses during the remote messaging session via the remote messaging facility client". MacNaughton teaches wherein a web client (a user) can subscribe to receive notifications about content and also subscribe to receive data content at specified intervals (see MacNaughton, col. 7, II. 61-67 and col. 8, II. 8-10). However, in related art, Tyra teaches a method wherein a queue is monitored by "listeners" persistently and when certain events appear in the queue, actions in regards to notifying subscribed users to the event are performed (see Tyra, col. 7, II. 11-15 and

II. 20-25) which teaches on the limitation of “maintaining a persistent listening connection” by the listeners continuously monitoring and further “listens to an event subscribed by the web client, said web client issuing requests and receiving responses during the remote messaging session via the remote messaging facility client” is taught by MacNaughton wherein MacNaughton teaches a user being able to subscribe to a notification service at specified intervals, therefore content data is monitored. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant’s invention would have found it obvious to enable MacNaughton’s invention to be able to persistently listen for events to happen instead of at only specified intervals as evidenced by Tyra, wherein Tyra teaches it is advantageous to have a data structure continuously monitored for certain events to occur. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Tyra with the the teachings of MacNaughton because Tyra teaches that it is advantageous to improve upon notification systems in regards to the changing of data within distributed systems (Tyra, column 1, II. 52-54). The limitation “a channel manager for managing zero or more channels designed for subscriptions of events, said managing associating each subscription with a channel to store the occurrences of the subscribed event and dispatching each stored event to the remote messaging facility client that represents the web client that subscribes the stored event” is taught by MacNaughton and Tyra wherein MacNaughton teaches the handling of user subscriptions in column 9, II. 27-40 and Tyra column 7, II. 20-25. The limitation “a message board comprising a plurality of slots for storing data, said data being manipulated by at least one event producer, manipulations of the data in said message

board triggering different events” is read broadly as a data structure that can be monitored for changes. The data structure taught by Tyra in column 7, lines 6-12, a queue, and the functions acted upon the queue as taught by Tyra are functionally equivalent wherein the queue is monitored for event changes and those subscribed to certain events are notified appropriately.

9. Regarding claim 7, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the system further comprising a message parser for parsing a request issued by a web client via a remote messaging facility client prior to generating a response for the request (MacNaughton, col. 7, lines 27-36). Tyra teaches on the use of multiple listener agents to perform event notification methods as taught in column 7, ll. 8-15, and therefore teaches on the limitation of using a plurality of listener agents, each of which corresponding to a different slot in the message board and connecting to at least one channel that store subscribed event related to the slot, each listener agent listening to the subscribed event occurred in the slot and sending the subscribed event to a corresponding channel. The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 6 applies equally as well to claim 7.

10. Regarding claim 8, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the system further comprising a producer registry for registering the at least one event producer (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 38-40); an access control profile for recording access control information used by said session manager in managing a remote messaging session for a web client (MacNaughton, col. 8, lines 58-60 and col. 13, lines 27-36); and a base filter agent, connecting to the listener agents, for filtering a subscribed event prior to sending the



subscribed event to a corresponding channel (MacNaughton, col. 4, lines 35-41). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 6 applies equally as well to claim 8.

11. Regarding claim 9, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the system further comprising a remote messaging facility server application programming interface, through which the at least one event producer communicates with the remote messaging facility server to register, to manipulate the message board, and to communicate with the web client (MacNaughton, col. 4, lines 16-27). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 6 applies equally as well to claim 9.

12. Regarding claim 12, MacNaughton teaches in column 7, ll. 8-13 a method for web-enabled 2-way remote messaging, comprising establishing a remote messaging session (persistent listening connection) between a web client (user) and an event provider (community server) via a remote messaging facility client (community client), connecting to the web client, and a remote messaging facility server, connecting to an event producer, the web client issuing requests and receiving responses during the remote messaging session (col. 3, lines 60-66, col. 6, lines 41-47, and col. 7, lines 8-13). MacNaughton teaches a user being able to subscribe to a notification service at specified intervals, therefore content data is monitored, which when read broadly reads on the limitation of "subscribing, by the web client via the remote messaging facility client, an event that is related to an action performed by the event producer on a slot of a message board located in the remote messaging facility server" (col. 3, lines 54-66, and col. 6, lines 30-34). MacNaughton teaches the notification at specified intervals but

Art Unit: 2142

does not explicitly teach "listening, by a listener agent in the remote messaging facility server, the event, the listener agent connecting to a channel, dedicated to the web client, and the slot, the listener agent receiving a notification when the action associated with the event is performed by the event producer on the slot; and dispatching the notification from the remote messaging facility server to the web client via a web server and the remote messaging facility client, said notification being encoded by the web server using a web protocol to generate a response". However, in related art, Tyra teaches a method wherein a queue is monitored by "listeners" persistently and when certain events appear in the queue, actions in regards to notifying subscribed users to the event are performed (see Tyra, col. 7, ll. 11-15 and ll. 20-25) which teaches on the limitation of "listening, by a listener agent in the remote messaging facility server, the event, the listener agent connecting to a channel, dedicated to the web client, and the slot, the listener agent receiving a notification when the action associated with the event is performed by the event producer on the slot" by the listeners continuously monitoring. Tyra further teaches event notifications being submitted to subscribers utilizing an exemplary web protocol, HTTP, which reads on "dispatching the notification from the remote messaging facility server to the web client via a web server and the remote messaging facility client, said notification being encoded by the web server using a web protocol to generate a response". One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention would have found it obvious to enable MacNaughton's invention to be able to persistently listen for events to happen instead of at only specified intervals as evidenced by Tyra, wherein Tyra teaches it is advantageous to have a data structure

Art Unit: 2142

continuously monitored for certain events to occur. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Tyra with the the teachings of MacNaughton because Tyra teaches that it is advantageous to improve upon notification systems in regards to the changing of data within distributed systems (Tyra, column 1, ll. 52-54). The limitation "a channel manager for managing zero or more channels designed for subscriptions of events, said managing associating each subscription with a channel to store the occurrences of the subscribed event and dispatching each stored event to the remote messaging facility client that represents the web client that subscribes the stored event" is taught by MacNaughton and Tyra wherein MacNaughton teaches the handling of user subscriptions in column 9, ll. 27-40 and Tyra column 7, ll. 20-25.

13. Regarding claim 13, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method wherein said requests includes at least one of a begin session request to start a remote messaging session (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 6-11); an end session request to finish a remote messaging session (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 19-23); a check session request to examine the status of a remote messaging session (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 53-60); a subscribe event request to subscribe an event with the remote messaging facility server (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 6-11); an unsubscribe event request to end a subscription of an event with the remote messaging facility server (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 19-23); a query data request to inquiry a data item in the message board (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 60-64); an listen event request to start a listening connection (MacNaughton teaches the need for a subscription request, col. 8, lines 8-

10); and a post message request to post a message from the web client to a message handler associated with a slot in the message board (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 60-64).

The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 12 applies equally as well to claim 13.

14. Regarding claim 14, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method wherein said requests are encoded using a web protocol (MacNaughton, col. 3, lines 54-65 and col. 6, lines 13-34). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 12 applies equally as well to claim 14.

15. Regarding claim 15, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method wherein said responses are encoded by said web server using a web protocol (MacNaughton, col. 3, lines 54-65 and col. 6, lines 13-34). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 12 applies equally as well to claim 15.

16. Regarding claim 16, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method wherein said web protocol used to encode the requests includes HyperText Transport Protocol (MacNaughton, col. 6, lines 13-34); and said web protocol used by said web server to encode the responses includes HyperText Transport Protocol (MacNaughton, col. 6, lines 13-34). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 12 applies equally as well to claim 16.

17. Regarding claim 17, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method wherein said establishing comprises sending a begin session request, by the web client via the remote messaging facility client and the web server, to the remote messaging facility server to establish the remote messaging session (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 6-11);

authenticating the web client with respect to the event producer to generate a decision of either positive or negative (MacNaughton, col. 6, lines 35-41, and 61-66, and col. 13, lines 29-37); and starting, by a session manager in the remote messaging facility server, the remote messaging session if the decision is positive (MacNaughton, col. 7, lines 8-14). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 12 applies equally as well to claim 17.

18. Regarding claim 18, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method wherein said subscribing comprises: sending a subscribe event request to the session manager to subscribe the event, the subscribe event request specifying the slot and the action (MacNaughton teaches on this necessary step, col. 8, ll. 8-10); setting up, by the session manager, a channel to store the occurrences of the event (Tyra, read broadly as a data structure teaches on the manipulation of listening to certain queue sections, col. 7, ll. 10-15); and connecting the channel with the listener agent associated with the slot of the message board (Tyra, read broadly as a data structure teaches on the manipulation of listening to certain queue sections, col. 7, ll. 10-15). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 12 applies equally as well to claim 18.

19. Regarding claim 19, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method wherein said listening comprises: sending an listen event request to the remote messaging facility server (Tyra, col. 7, ll. 20-25); setting up a listening connection, for the event subscribed in said subscribing, said listening connection associating with the channel dedicated to the web client (Tyra, col. 7, ll. 20-25); monitoring, by the listener agent connecting to

both the channel and the slot, the action performed by the event producer on the slot that triggers the event (Tyra, col. 7, ll. 20-25); receiving the notification corresponding to the subscribed event when the action is performed by said event producer (Tyra, col. 7, ll. 25-30); and adding, by the listener agent, the notification to the channel (Tyra, col. 7, ll. 25-30). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 12 applies equally as well to claim 19.

20. Regarding claim 20, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method further comprising filtering the notification prior to adding the notification to the channel (MacNaughton, col. 4, lines 35-41). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 12 applies equally as well to claim 20.

21. Regarding claim 21, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method wherein dispatching comprises: forwarding, by a channel manager that manages the channel, the notification to the web server (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 28-34); encoding, by the web server, the notification using the web protocol to generate the response (MacNaughton, col. 6, lines 13-34); and sending the response to the web client via the remote messaging facility client (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 28-34). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 12 applies equally as well to claim 21.

22. Regarding claims 24 and 39, MacNaughton teaches in column 7, ll. 8-13 a method for a remote messaging facility server, comprising: establishing a remote messaging session based on a begin session request sent from a web client (user) via a remote messaging facility client (community client) and a web server (community web

server). MacNaughton teaches a user being able to subscribe to a notification service at specified intervals, therefore content data is monitored, which when read broadly reads on the limitation of "subscribing an event based on a subscribe event request specifying a slot on a message board in the remote messaging facility server and an action, wherein the event is defined with respect to the action performed on the slot by an event producer" (col. 3, lines 54-66, and col. 6, lines 30-34). MacNaughton teaches the notification at specified intervals but does not explicitly teach "listening, by a listener agent in the remote messaging facility server, the event, the listener agent connecting to a channel, dedicated to the web client, and the slot, the listener agent receiving a notification when the action associated with the event is performed by the event producer on the slot; and dispatching the notification from the remote messaging facility server to the web client via a web server and the remote messaging facility client, said notification being encoded by the web server using a web protocol to generate a response". However, in related art, Tyra teaches a method wherein a queue is monitored by "listeners" persistently and when certain events appear in the queue, actions in regards to notifying subscribed users to the event are performed (see Tyra, col. 7, ll. 11-15 and ll. 20-25) which teaches on the limitation of "listening, by a listener agent in the remote messaging facility server, the even, the listener agent connecting to a channel, dedicated to the web client, and the slot, the listener agent receiving a notification when the action associated with the event is performed by the event producer on the slot" by the listeners continuously monitoring. Tyra further teaches event notifications being submitted to subscribers utilizing an exemplary web protocol,

Art Unit: 2142

HTTP, which reads on “dispatching the notification from the remote messaging facility server to the web client via a web server and the remote messaging facility client, said notification being encoded by the web server using a web protocol to generate a response”. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant’s invention would have found it obvious to enable MacNaughton’s invention to be able to persistently listen for events to happen instead of at only specified intervals as evidenced by Tyra, wherein Tyra teaches it is advantageous to have a data structure continuously monitored for certain events to occur. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Tyra with the the teachings of MacNaughton because Tyra teaches that it is advantageous to improve upon notification systems in regards to the changing of data within distributed systems (Tyra, column 1, ll. 52-54). The limitation “a channel manager for managing zero or more channels designed for subscriptions of events, said managing associating each subscription with a channel to store the occurrences of the subscribed event and dispatching each stored event to the remote messaging facility client that represents the web client that subscribes the stored event” is taught by MacNaughton and Tyra wherein MacNaughton teaches the handling of user subscriptions in column 9, ll. 27-40 and Tyra column 7, ll. 20-25.

23. Regarding claims 25 and 40, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method wherein the establishing comprises: receiving the begin session request from the web client, authenticating the web client (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 6-11, and col. 6, lines 35-41, and 61-66, and col. 13, lines 29-37); and starting the remote messaging session if the authentication passes (MacNaughton, col. 7, lines 8-14). The rationale used to combine



MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claims 24 and 39 apply equally as well to claims 25 and 40.

24. Regarding claims 26 and 41, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method wherein the subscribing comprises: receiving the subscribe event request from the web client (MacNaughton, col. 8, ll. 8-10); setting up a channel associating with the remote messaging session (Tyra, col. 7, ll. 20-25); and connecting the channel with a listener agent associated with the slot of the message board (Tyra, col. 7, ll. 15-20). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claims 24 and 39 apply equally as well to claims 26 and 41.

25. Regarding claims 27 and 42, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method wherein the listening comprises: monitoring the slot on the message board to observe the event related to the action to be performed by the event producer on the slot Tyra, col. 7, ll. 20-25); receiving the notification when the event is observed (col. 7, ll. 20-25); and adding the notification to the channel set up for the remote messaging session (col. 7, ll. 25-30). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claims 24 and 39 apply equally as well to claims 27 and 42.

26. Regarding claims 28 and 43, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method further comprising: filtering, by a filter agent, the notification prior to said adding (MacNaughton, col. 4, lines 35-41). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claims 24 and 39 apply equally as well to claims 28 and 43.

Art Unit: 2142

27. Regarding claims 29 and 44, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method wherein said dispatching comprises: forwarding, by the channel, the notification to the web server (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 28-34); encoding, by the web server, the notification using the web protocol to generate the response (MacNaughton, col. 6, lines 13-34); and sending the response to the web client via the remote messaging facility client (MacNaughton, col. 9, lines 28-34). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claims 24 and 39 applies equally as well to claims 29 and 44.

28. Regarding claim 30, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method further comprising registering the event producer with the message board in the remote messaging facility server (col. 4, lines 16-27). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 24 applies equally as well to claim 30.

29. Regarding claim 31, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method further comprising: specifying a session agent that authenticates a web client for the event producer (MacNaughton, col. 6, lines 35-41, and 61-66, and col. 13, lines 29-37); and specifying a filtering agent that filters an observed event associated with the event producer (MacNaughton, col. 4, lines 35-41). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 24 applies equally as well to claim 31.

30. Regarding claim 32, MacNaughton and Tyra teach the method further comprising updating, by an event producer, a slot of the message board (MacNaughton, col. 4, lines 28-35). The rationale used to combine MacNaughton and Tyra in the rejection of claim 24 applies equally as well to claim 32.

***Response to Arguments***

31. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 4-9, 12-21, 24-32 and 39-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

32. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Minami et al. (US 6,968,499 B1) teaches a method and apparatus for deciding display information.

Ruckdashel (US 6,038,542) teaches a system for notifying an individual of a previously scheduled event.

Wishoff (US 2002/0051017) teaches a notification device for a graphical user environment.

Joong (US 6,549,776 B1) teaches a system, method, and apparatus for pushing data in a direct digital call environment.

Cantone et al. (US 6,351,761 B1) teaches an information stream management push-pull based server for gathering and distributing articles and messages specified by the user.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Benjamin A. Ailes whose telephone number is (571)272-3899. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4, IFP Work Schedule.

Art Unit: 2142

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on (571)272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

baa



ANDREW CALDWELL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER



BEATRIZ PRIETO  
PRIMARY EXAMINER